

| Proposal Title :  | Kempsey LEP 2013 – Administrative amendments to Clause 4.2A and 4.2C for Boundary<br>Alterations and Rural Dwellings.  |   |                              |  |
|---|--|---|------------------------------|--|
| Proposal Summary  | The planning proposal seeks to amend Kempsey LEP 2013 to make changes to the provisions of clauses 4.2A and 4.2C to better address boundary alteration proposals and the recognition of dwelling entitlements on rural lots. |   |                              |  |
| PP Number :   | PP_2016_KEMPS_004_00   | Dop File No :   | 16/11378                     |  |
| oposal Details  |  |   |                              |  |
| Date Planning<br>Proposal Received  | 13-Sep-2016  | LGA covered :   | Kempsey                      |  |
| Region :  | Northern   | RPA :   | Kempsey Shire Council        |  |
| State Electorate :  | OXLEY  | Section of the Act :                                    | 55 - Planning Proposal       |  |
| LEP Type :  | Policy   |   |                              |  |
| R   | nis planning proposal applies to al<br>U3 Forestry, RU4 Primary Producti<br>nvironmental Conservation, E3 Env<br>pres in the Kempsey local governm   | on Small Lots, RU5 Village,<br>vironmental Management a | R5 Large Lot Residential, E2 |  |
|   | icer Contact Details   |   |                              |  |
| Contact Name :  | Paul Garnett   |   |                              |  |
| Contact Number :  | 0266416607   |   |                              |  |
|   | paul.garnett@planning.nsw.gov  |   |                              |  |
| Contact Email :   | paul.gamen@planning.nsw.gov  | .au   |                              |  |
| Contact Email :<br>RPA Contact Deta   |  | .au   |                              |  |
|   |  | .au   |                              |  |
| RPA Contact Deta  | ails   | .au   |                              |  |
| RPA Contact Deta<br>Contact Name :  | ails<br>Peter Orr  |   |                              |  |
| RPA Contact Deta<br>Contact Name :<br>Contact Number :<br>Contact Email :                     | ails<br>Peter Orr<br>0265663200  |   |                              |  |
| RPA Contact Deta<br>Contact Name :<br>Contact Number :<br>Contact Email :                     | ails<br>Peter Orr<br>0265663200<br>peter.orr@kempsey.nsw.gov.au  |   |                              |  |
| RPA Contact Deta<br>Contact Name :<br>Contact Number :<br>Contact Email :<br>DoP Project Mana | ails<br>Peter Orr<br>0265663200<br>peter.orr@kempsey.nsw.gov.au<br>nger Contact Details  |   |                              |  |

| and Release Data   |  |   |  |
|--|--|---|--|
| Growth Centre :  |  | Release Area Name :   |  |
| Regional / Sub<br>Regional Strategy :  | 26   | Consistent with Strategy:   |  |
| MDP Number :   |  | Date of Release :   |  |
| Area of Release (Ha)   |  | Type of Release (eg<br>Residential /<br>Employment land) :  |  |
| No. of Lots :  | 0  | No. of Dwellings<br>(where relevant) :  | 0  |
| Gross Floor Area:  | 0  | No of Jobs Created :  | 0  |
| The NSW Government<br>Lobbyists Code of<br>Conduct has been<br>complied with :   | Yes  |   |  |
| If No, comment :   | The Department of Planning and Environment's Code of Practice in relation to<br>communications and meetings with lobbyists has been complied with to the best of the<br>Region's knowledge.  |   |  |
| Have there been<br>meetings or<br>communications with<br>registered lobbyists? : | Νο   |   |  |
| If Yes, comment :  | _  | ffice has not met any lobbyists in relati<br>f any meeting between other officers w<br>al.  |  |
| Supporting notes   |  |   |  |
| Internal Supporting<br>Notes :   |  |   |  |
| External Supporting<br>Notes :   | <ul> <li>The Kempsey LEP 2013 contains provisions that enable boundary adjustments of rural properties (clause 4.2C) and regulate dwellings on rural properties (clause 4.2A). Council proposes minor changes to these clauses to:</li> <li>1. Change the term "boundary adjustment" to "boundary change";</li> <li>2. Clarify that the number of dwellings permitted on a lot after a boundary adjustment/change will not increase;</li> <li>3. Insert a new clause requiring consideration of the natural or physical constraints of the land when considering a boundary adjustment/change;</li> <li>4. Inserting a new provision which ensures that boundary adjustments/changes do not result in the creation of new lots that can be further subdivided;</li> <li>5. Remove the word 'minor' from clause 4.2A(3)(e)(i); and</li> <li>6. Clarify that lots created by the boundary adjustment/change provisions, split zone lot subdivision provisions, or created under the Kempsey LEP 1987, will have a dwelling entitlement.</li> </ul> |   |  |
|  | <ol> <li>Insert a new clause<br/>land when considering</li> <li>Inserting a new pro-<br/>result in the creation of</li> <li>Remove the word 'n</li> <li>Clarify that lots cre<br/>subdivision provisions,</li> </ol>   | not increase;<br>e requiring consideration of the natural<br>a boundary adjustment/change;<br>ovision which ensures that boundary ad<br>new lots that can be further subdivide<br>minor' from clause 4.2A(3)(e)(i); and<br>ated by the boundary adjustment/chan | or physical constraints of the<br>djustments/changes do not<br>d;<br>ge provisions, split zone lot |
| equacy Assessmen   | <ol> <li>Insert a new clause<br/>land when considering</li> <li>Inserting a new pro-<br/>result in the creation of</li> <li>Remove the word 'n</li> <li>Clarify that lots cre<br/>subdivision provisions,<br/>entitlement.</li> </ol>  | not increase;<br>e requiring consideration of the natural<br>a boundary adjustment/change;<br>ovision which ensures that boundary ad<br>new lots that can be further subdivide<br>minor' from clause 4.2A(3)(e)(i); and<br>ated by the boundary adjustment/chan | or physical constraints of the<br>djustments/changes do not<br>d;<br>ge provisions, split zone lot |
| equacy Assessmen<br>Statement of the obj   | <ol> <li>Insert a new clause<br/>land when considering</li> <li>Inserting a new pro-<br/>result in the creation of</li> <li>Remove the word 'n</li> <li>Clarify that lots cre<br/>subdivision provisions,<br/>entitlement.</li> </ol>  | not increase;<br>e requiring consideration of the natural<br>a boundary adjustment/change;<br>ovision which ensures that boundary ad<br>new lots that can be further subdivide<br>minor' from clause 4.2A(3)(e)(i); and<br>ated by the boundary adjustment/chan | or physical constraints of the<br>djustments/changes do not<br>d;<br>ge provisions, split zone lot |
|  | <ol> <li>Insert a new clause<br/>land when considering</li> <li>Inserting a new pro-<br/>result in the creation of</li> <li>Remove the word 'n</li> <li>Clarify that lots cre<br/>subdivision provisions,<br/>entitlement.</li> </ol> t  | not increase;<br>e requiring consideration of the natural<br>a boundary adjustment/change;<br>ovision which ensures that boundary ad<br>new lots that can be further subdivide<br>minor' from clause 4.2A(3)(e)(i); and<br>ated by the boundary adjustment/chan | or physical constraints of the<br>djustments/changes do not<br>d;<br>ge provisions, split zone lot |

| Explanation of provisi                                       | ions provided - s55   | (2)(b)   |
|--|---|--|
| Is an explanation of provis                                  | ions provided? Yes  |  |
| Comment :  | The explanation of provisions adequately addresses the intended method of achieving the objectives of the planning proposal. The planning proposal includes a plain English explanation of the issues with the existing terminology in clauses 4.2A and 4.2C and describes the proposed changes to these clauses. The planning proposal includes draft clauses in Appendix A. |  |
| Justification - s55 (2)(                                     | c)  |  |
| a) Has Council's strategy l                                  | been agreed to by the D   | irector General? Yes   |
| b) S.117 directions identifi                                 | ed by RPA :   | 1.2 Rural Zones  |
| * May need the Director G                                    | eneral's agreement  | 1.5 Rural Lands  |
|  | onoraro agroomoni   | 2.1 Environment Protection Zones   |
|  |   | 2.2 Coastal Protection   |
|  |   | 2.3 Heritage Conservation<br>2.4 Recreation Vehicle Areas  |
|  |   | 3.1 Residential Zones  |
|  |   | 3.3 Home Occupations   |
|  |   | 3.4 Integrating Land Use and Transport   |
|  |   | 3.5 Development Near Licensed Aerodromes   |
|  |   | 4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils   |
|  |   | 4.2 Mine Subsidence and Unstable Land  |
|  |   | 4.3 Flood Prone Land<br>4.4 Planning for Pushfire Protection   |
|  |   | 4.4 Planning for Bushfire Protection<br>5.1 Implementation of Regional Strategies  |
|  |   | 6.1 Approval and Referral Requirements   |
|  |   | 6.2 Reserving Land for Public Purposes   |
|  |   | 6.3 Site Specific Provisions   |
|  |   | 3.6 Shooting Ranges  |
| Is the Director General                                      | s agreement required?   | Yes  |
| c) Consistent with Standar                                   | d Instrument (LEPs) Ord   | der 2006 : <b>Yes</b>  |
| d) Which SEPPs have the                                      | RPA identified?   | SEPP No 14—Coastal Wetlands  |
|  |   | SEPP No 26—Littoral Rainforests  |
|  |   | SEPP No 30—Intensive Agriculture   |
|  |   | SEPP No 44—Koala Habitat Protection  |
|  |   | SEPP No 62—Sustainable Aquaculture<br>SEPP No 71—Coastal Protection  |
|  |   | SEPP (Exempt and Complying Development Codes) 2008   |
|  |   | SEPP (Rural Lands) 2008  |
| e) List any other<br>matters that need to<br>be considered : |   |  |
| Have inconsistencies with                                    | items a), b) and d) being   | g adequately justified? Yes  |
| If No, explain :   | See the assessment  | section of this report.  |
| Mapping Provided - s5  | i5(2)(d)  |  |
| Is mapping provided? No                                      | -   |  |
| Comment :  | No mana ara raguira   | d for the LEP amendment. The planning proposal does not propose  |
| comment .  | any amendments to the zones to which c  | the LEP amendment. The planning proposal does not propose<br>the LEP maps. The proposed provisions will apply to all land within<br>lauses 4.2A and 4.2 C of the Kempsey LEP 2013 apply so there is no<br>p which identifies the subject land. |

| Community consult                       | ation - s55(2)(e)  |
|---|--|
| Has community consult                   | ation been proposed? Yes   |
| Comment :                               | The planning proposal does not nominate a community consultation period. The proposal makes only minor changes to the provisions in clauses 4.2A and 4.2C to clarify requirements relating to boundary adjustments and dwelling entitlements. The proposal does not reclassify land, does not rezone land and does not raise any issues for infrastructure provision or issues of State or regional planning significance. It is considered that the proposal is a 'low impact' proposal and therefore a community consultation period of 14 days would be adequate. |
| Additional Director                     | General's requirements   |
| Are there any additiona                 | Director General's requirements? No  |
| If Yes, reasons :                       |  |
| Overall adequacy of                     | the proposal   |
| Does the proposal mee                   | t the adequacy criteria? Yes   |
| If No, comment∷                         | Time Line<br>The RPA has provided a project timeline which estimates the completion of the<br>planning proposal in March 2017. Therefore a 9 month period for completion of the<br>planning proposal is recommended.   |
|   | Delegation.<br>Council has provided a completed 'Evaluation Criteria for the Delegation of Plan Making<br>Functions' form. The evaluation concludes that the proposal can be delegated to<br>Council for making of the LEP amendment. It is considered that the matter is of local<br>significance and it is recommended that an Authorisation for the execution of<br>delegation be issued to Kempsey Council in this instance.   |
|   | <ul> <li>Overall Adequacy</li> <li>The planning proposal satisfies the adequacy criteria by;</li> <li>1. Providing appropriate objectives and intended outcomes.</li> <li>2. Providing a suitable explanation of the provisions proposed for the LEP to achieve the outcomes.</li> <li>3. Providing an adequate justification for the proposal.</li> <li>4. Outlining a proposed community consultation program.</li> <li>5. Providing a project time line</li> <li>6. Providing an evaluation of the delegation of plan making functions</li> </ul>                 |
| Proposal Assessment                     |  |
| Principal LEP:                          |  |
| Due Date :                              |  |
| Comments in relation to Principal LEP : | The Kempsey LEP commenced in 2013. This planning proposal seeks an amendment to the<br>Kempsey LEP 2013.   |

#### **Assessment Criteria**

Need for planning<br/>proposal :The proposal to amend the provisions in clauses 4.2A and 4.2C of the Kempsey LEP 2013 is<br/>not the subject of a specific strategic study or report. The need for these amendments has<br/>arisen due to issues identified by Council in the application of these controls in relation to<br/>development applications.

Council has identified the following main issues relating to the creation of rural lots:
The boundary adjustment provisions contained in clause 4.2C are not achieving the outcomes Council intended and are inconsistent with similar provisions in the LEPs of neighbouring councils;

• boundary adjustments undertaken under clause 4.2C of the LEP may result in lots that are smaller than the minimum lot size shown for the land and therefore may lose the ability to have a dwelling erected on the lot;

• lots created using clause 4.1B to subdivide split zoned lots should have a dwelling entitlement; and

• lots created under the provisions of the former Kempsey LEP 1987 by varying the minimum lot size development standard using SEPP 1 should have their dwelling entitlements recognised in clause 4.2A.

The proposed changes include the following:

Clause 4.2A

1. Remove the word 'minor' from clause 4.2A(3)(e)(i) as it is unnecessarily restrictive;

2. Clarify that lots created by the boundary adjustment/change provisions in clause 4.2C will have a dwelling eligibility;

3. Clarify that lots created using the provisions of clause 4.1B (Split zoned lot subdivision) will have a dwelling eligibility;

4. Clarify that lots created under the provisions of Kempsey LEP 1987 and SEPP 1 have a dwelling eligibility; and

5. Clarify that lots created using the variation of development standards in clause 4.6 of the Kempsey LEP 2013 will have a dwelling eligibility.

#### Clause 4.2C

1. Change the term "boundary adjustment" to "boundary change";

2. Clarify that the number of dwellings permitted on a lot after a boundary adjustment/change will not increase;

3. Insert a new clause requiring consideration of the natural or physical constraints of the land when considering a boundary adjustment/change;

4. Inserting a new provisions which ensure that boundary adjustments/changes do not result in the creation of new lots that can be further subdivided; and

The proposed changes to the clauses are not expected to result in a significant increase in development or density of residential development in the rural zones. The existing boundary adjustment clause does not allow for the creation of additional lots and this will not change.

There is a chance that the recognition of dwelling entitlements for undersized lots created under the boundary adjustment provisions, the split zoned lot provisions, the variation of development standard provisions, or the previous Kempsey LEP 1987 may result in a small number of lots being granted a dwelling entitlement where one did not originally exist. This increase in the potential for dwellings on rural land is not expected to be significant as the majority of lots created by Council under these provisions would have occurred with the expectation that a dwelling could be erected on these lots.

The current provisions in Kempsey LEP 2013 could enable the approval of a dwelling on undersized lots with a variation to the development standard pursuant to clause 4.6 of the LEP.

Where an undersized lot was created pursuant to the provisions of the Kempsey LEP 2013 and SEPP 1, the concurrence of the Secretary would have been provided, or could have been assumed, for the approval of the development application. The recognition of the dwelling eligibility of these lots is not considered to be of State or regional significance.

Enabling a dwelling entitlement for a lot created by the subdivision of a split zoned lot under clause 4.1B of the LEP will also not result in a significant increase in development or density on rural land. The split zone lot clause only applies to land that is partly zoned residential, business or industrial and requires that the resultant lot contains a portion of land which is zoned residential, business or industrial which complies with the minimum lot size for that zone.

The Explanation of Provisions in the planning proposal states that the LEP amendment will include provisions which will ensure that boundary changes will not facilitate new lots which can be further subdivided. However the example clause which Council has included in Appendix A (subclause 4.2C(5)) may be interpreted to preclude the use of existing lots which can currently be further subdivided in a boundary change. This issue was raised with Council however Council advised it was satisfied with the proposed drafting in the Appendix and would address this further with Parliamentary Counsel's Office at legal drafting stage. Council noted that this wording was used in the equivalent Bellingen and Nambucca LEP clauses. The explanation of provisions, Table 2, does clarify that these provisions will not create 'new' lots that can be further subdivided and therefore the final wording of the clause can be prepared by Parliamentary Counsel's Office.

The proposed amendments to the LEP are the best means of achieving the intent of the planning proposal. The proposed changes are intended to clarify Council's interpretation of the provisions and make them consistent with the LEPs of other neighbouring councils.

The principles behind the proposed additional provisions are considered to be appropriate.

| Consistency with<br>strategic planning<br>framework : | Mid North Coast Regional Strategy (MNCRS)<br>The proposed amendment to the Kempsey LEP 2013 to refine the provisions relating to<br>boundary alterations and rural dwellings is not inconsistent with the MNCRS. The<br>proposed changes to the provisions will facilitate the orderly development of rural land<br>and will not result in an unacceptable increase in the density of development in rural<br>areas.  |  |  |
|---|---|--|--|
|   | The provisions relating to boundary alterations will still require the consideration of issues<br>such a land use conflict and the agricultural viability of the land, and will include a new<br>consideration of the physical or natural constraints of the land. The provisions will still<br>require development consent for subdivision.  |  |  |
|   | The changes to the provisions relating to the dwellings in rural areas (clause 4.2A) will recognise the dwelling eligibility of lots created by Council which were intended to accommodate a dwelling. The proposed changes will negate the need to undertake further variations to minimum lot size development standards to approve a dwelling when the lot had been created for that purpose in the first instance. This will reduce duplication and simplify the development consent process for dwellings in rural areas. The proposed changes will not remove the requirement to obtain approval for dwellings in rural areas and therefore will enable consideration of the suitability of the site. |  |  |
|   | The LEP will still contain provisions which apply minimum subdivision standards for rural land and limit dwellings in rural and environmental zones as required by the MNCRS.   |  |  |
|   | Local Strategic Plans<br>The proposed changes to the provisions are not inconsistent with the RPA's strategies and<br>structure plan.   |  |  |
|   | SEPPS<br>The planning proposal identifies numerous SEPPs which are applicable to the land to<br>which the planning proposal will apply, however it does not identify any inconsistencies<br>with these SEPPs.   |  |  |
|   | SEPP (Rural Lands) 2008 is relevant to the planning proposal as it contains principles for<br>subdivision of rural land. The proposed provisions will not be inconsistent with the Rural<br>Subdivision Principles or Rural Planning Principles of the SEPP (Rural Lands) 2008 as the<br>provisions will;   |  |  |
|   | <ol> <li>not contribute to the unnecessary fragmentation of rural land since the boundary<br/>alteration provisions will not enable the creation of additional lots or the potential for<br/>further fragmentation of rural land;</li> </ol>  |  |  |
|   | <ol> <li>require consideration of agricultural viability of land prior to the subdivision/boundary alteration being approved ;</li> <li>take account of the constraints of the land and ensure that the subdivision/boundary</li> </ol>   |  |  |
|   | alteration is appropriate having regard to the natural and physical characteristics of the<br>land and the existing land use; and<br>4. not create significant additional opportunities for dwellings in rural zones.<br>The proposal is otherwise consistent with other SEPPs.   |  |  |
|   | Standard Instrument LEP<br>The principles behind the proposed additional provisions are not inconsistent with the<br>mandatory clauses of the Standard Instrument LEP.  |  |  |
|   | S117 Directions.<br>The following S117 directions are applicable to the proposal 1.2 Rural Zones, 1.5 Rural<br>Lands, 2.1, Environmental Protection Zones, 2.2 Coastal Protection, 2.3 Heritage<br>Conservation, 2.4 Recreation Vehicle Areas, 3.2 Caravan Parks and Manufactured Home<br>Estates, 3.3 Home Occupations, 3.4 Integrating Land Use and Transport, 3.5 Development<br>Near Licensed Aerodromes, 4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils, 4.3 Flood Prone Land, 4.4 Planning for<br>Bushfire Protection, 5.1 Implementation of Regional Strategies, 6.1 Approval and Referral<br>Requirements, and 6.2 Reserving Land for Public Purposes.  |  |  |

|   |  | pplicable to the planning prop<br>offects land within a rural or e<br>ning Principles in SEPP (Rura<br>ges to the boundary alteration<br>to be inconsistent with the R<br>sal is not inconsistent with the<br>boundary alteration and rural<br>in the development potential<br>fate soils. Therefore the prop<br>a Soils or 4.3 Flood Prone lan<br>offire Protection is relevant to<br>I dwelling provisions will app | osal. The direction provides<br>nvironmental zone must be<br>al Lands) 2008. As previously<br>o provisions and rural dwelling<br>ural Planning Principles of the<br>e terms of this direction.<br>dwelling provisions will not<br>of rural land which may be<br>osal will not be inconsistent<br>d.<br>the proposal. The proposed<br>ly to the majority of rural land |
|---|--|---|---|
|   | with the Commissioner of the I<br>been issued. Until this consult<br>direction remains unresolved.   | NSW Rural Fire Service after a<br>ation has occurred the consist  | a gateway determination has stency of the proposal with the   |
|   | The planning proposal is other   | wise consistent with S117 di  | rections.   |
| Environmental social economic impacts :     | The planning proposal will not have any direct adverse impact on critical habitat or threatened species, populations or ecological communities, or their habitats. Similarly the planning proposal will not have any direct adverse effect on the natural, built or socio-economic environment.  |   |   |
|   | The planning proposal has the potential to have indirect effects on the natural and<br>socioeconomic environments when boundary alterations occur or when rural dwellings<br>are proposed. However these impacts will vary considerably depending on the<br>characteristics of the subject land and any indirect impact is most appropriately addressed<br>by the development assessment process. Development approval will still be required for<br>boundary adjustments and rural dwellings. |   |   |
|   | The planning proposal has given consideration to social and economic impacts of proposed amendment. The social and economic impacts will be largely positive as amendment to the provisions will provide certainty and clarity for proponents and improve consistency with neighbouring LGAs.  |   |   |
| Assessment Proces                           | S  |   |   |
|   |  |   |   |
| Proposal type :                             | Routine  | Community Consultation<br>Period :  | 14 Days   |
| Timeframe to make<br>LEP :                  | 9 months   | Delegation :  | RPA   |
| Public Authority<br>Consultation - 56(2)(d) | NSW Rural Fire Service   |   |   |

Page 8 of 10

No

Yes

Is Public Hearing by the PAC required?

(2)(a) Should the matter proceed ?

If no, provide reasons :

Resubmission - s56(2)(b) : No If Yes, reasons : Identify any additional studies, if required. If Other, provide reasons Identify any internal consultations, if required : No internal consultation required Is the provision and funding of state infrastructure relevant to this plan? No If Yes, reasons : Documents Document File Name DocumentType Name Is Public 2016-08-22 Council cover letter for planning **Proposal Covering Letter** Yes proposal.pdf Planning Proposal\_Boundary Adjustments.docx Proposal Yes Planning Team Recommendation Preparation of the planning proposal supported at this stage : Recommended with Conditions S.117 directions: 1.2 Rural Zones 1.5 Rural Lands 2.1 Environment Protection Zones 2.2 Coastal Protection 2.3 Heritage Conservation 2.4 Recreation Vehicle Areas **3.1 Residential Zones** 3.3 Home Occupations 3.4 Integrating Land Use and Transport 3.5 Development Near Licensed Aerodromes 4.1 Acid Sulfate Soils 4.2 Mine Subsidence and Unstable Land 4.3 Flood Prone Land 4.4 Planning for Bushfire Protection 5.1 Implementation of Regional Strategies 6.1 Approval and Referral Requirements 6.2 Reserving Land for Public Purposes 6.3 Site Specific Provisions 3.6 Shooting Ranges Additional Information : It is recommended that; 1. The planning proposal proceed as a 'routine' planning proposal. 2. The planning proposal is to be completed within 9 months. 3. That a community consultation period of 14 days is necessary for the planning proposal. 4. That the RPA consult with the Commissioner of the NSW Rural Fire Services in accordance with the requirements of S117 Direction 4.4 Planning for Bushfire Protection. Supporting Reasons : The reasons for the recommendation are as follows;

| Kempsey LEP 2013 – Administrative amendments to Clause 4.2A and 4.2C for Boundary<br>Alterations and Rural Dwellings. |   |  |
|---|---|--|
|   | <ol> <li>The proposed provisions will clarify the provisions relating to boundary alterations<br/>and rural dwellings.</li> <li>The principles of the proposed provisions are supported and are not considered to be<br/>inconsistent with the intent of the Standard LEP.</li> </ol> |  |
| Signature:  | A   |  |
| Printed Name:   | Craig Diss Date: 21/9/16  |  |